

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4-9, 18-30, 33, 39 and 47-52 are pending in this application with claims 18-30 and 47-51 having been withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 4 have been amended, claim 52 has been added and claims 2, 10, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38 and 40-46 have been canceled. Claims 1, 4, 18, 24 and 28 are independent. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

**I. Amendment**

Support for the amendment to claim 1 and new claim 52 can be found in the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0164] and [0165]. Support for the amendment to claim 4 can be found in the specification at, for example, paragraph [0196]. Thus, no new matter is added.

**II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 31-41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Japanese Patent Publication No. 2004-002911 to Kako et al. ("Kako") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,316,595 to Hamada; and rejects claims 42-45\* under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kako in view of Hamada and further in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 2000-034503 to Ishizake et al. ("Ishizake"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "the passivation layer is formed by a chemical change of the amorphous layer caused by the chemical conversion treatment of the surface of the amorphous layer." Independent claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, "a roughness Ra of a boundary between the magnet body and the amorphous layer ranges from 1.27 to 1.45  $\mu\text{m}$ , and a roughness Ra of a boundary between the amorphous layer and the protecting layer ranges from 0.68 to 0.85  $\mu\text{m}$ ." The applied references fail to teach or render obvious the recited features of independent claims 1 and 4.

---

\* It appears the Examiner intends to reject claims 42-46.

**A. Claim 1**

Independent claim 1 recites, "the passivation layer is formed by a chemical change of the amorphous layer caused by the chemical conversion treatment of the surface of the amorphous layer." Such chemical change imparts structural features to the passivation layer.

The Office Action relies on Hamada for disclosing the recited passivation layer. However, the anticorrosive thin film layer of Hamada is formed by vapor deposition, and the oxide layer is formed by heat treatment of the surface of the vapor deposited layer. See Abstract and col. 13, lines 41-48 of Hamada. These layers of Hamada are different from the recited passivation layer, which is formed by a chemical change of the amorphous layer. That is, the recited chemical change imparts a different structural feature than that disclosed in Hamada. Accordingly, Hamada fails to teach or render obvious that the passivation layer is formed by a chemical change of the amorphous layer caused by the chemical conversion treatment of the surface of the amorphous layer. Kako and Ishizake fail to cure the deficiencies of Hamada.

**B. Claim 4**

Independent claim 4 recites, "a roughness Ra of a boundary between the magnet body and the amorphous layer ranges from 1.27 to 1.45  $\mu\text{m}$ , and a roughness Ra of a boundary between the amorphous layer and the protecting layer ranges from 0.68 to 0.85  $\mu\text{m}$ ."

The present application discloses a range for the roughness of the boundary between the magnet body and the amorphous layer and the roughness of the boundary between the amorphous layer and the protecting layer. Hamada fails to disclose a specific range for the roughness of the boundaries. Thus, the applied references fail to teach or render obvious a roughness Ra of a boundary between the magnet body and the amorphous layer ranges from 1.27 to 1.45  $\mu\text{m}$ , and a roughness Ra of a boundary between the amorphous layer and the protecting layer ranges from 0.68 to 0.85  $\mu\text{m}$ . Kako and Ishizake fail to cure the deficiencies

of Hamada. Accordingly, the applied references fail to teach or render obvious the recited features of independent claim 4.

\* \* \*

The dependent claims are patentable at least due to their dependence on allowable independent claims 1 and 4 and for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims is respectfully requested.

**III. New Claim 52 is Patentable**

New claim 52 is added. New claim 52 is patentable at least due to its dependence on allowable independent claim 1 and for the additional features it recites.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 4-9, 18-30, 33, 39 and 47-52 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Obert H. Chu  
Registration No. 52,744

JAO:OHC/kjb

Attachment:  
Request for Continued Examination

Date: September 8, 2010

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---